

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
v.) CRIMINAL No. 12-00293-KD
)
MOHAMMAD ABDUL RAHMAN)
 ABUKHDAIR, and)
 RANDY LAMAR WILSON,)

ORDER

This case is before the Court on the following matters: 1) the government's motion for an omnibus protective order (doc. 30); 2) defendant Randy Lamar Wilson's objection to the government's proposed protective order (doc. 33); Wilson's proposed protective order (doc. 41), which was adopted by defendant Mohammad Abdul Abukhdair (doc. 63); 3) the government's reply (doc. 45) to defendant's proposed protective order; 4) defendant Wilson's response (doc. 46) to the government's reply; 5) defendant Wilson's request to reconsider the order of detention (doc. 27) issued on December 21, 2012 and motion to inspect in camera the notes taken by the agents at the time of the defendant's arrest (doc. 32), and 6) the government's response (doc. 58) to

ORDERED as follows:

1. The government's motion for a protective order (doc. 30) is hereby **GRANTED** for the reasons stated by the government in its motion and response (doc. 45) to defendant Wilson's proposed protective order, and defendants' objections to same

(docs. 33, 41, 46 and 63) are hereby overruled. The defendants have failed to satisfy the undersigned that the protective order proposed by the government will in any way “hamper [their] right to independently develop information pertaining to his case,” including the assertion of “an outrageous governmental misconduct defense.” (Doc. 33 at 1). In addition, the undersigned finds that the government has, as required by Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, shown good cause for the imposition of its proposed protective order.

2. Defendant Wilson’s request for the undersigned to reconsider the order of detention issued on December 21, 2012 (doc. 27) and motion to inspect *in camera* the rough notes taken by the agents at the time of the defendant Wilson’s arrest (doc. 32) is hereby **DENIED** for the reasons stated by the government in its response (doc. 58). Upon consideration of the defendant’s motion and the detention order, the court finds that the defendant has failed to demonstrate that any new evidence calls into question the undersigned’s previous rationale for ordering the pretrial detention of the defendant.

DONE this 24th day of January, 2013.

/s/ Katherine P. Nelson
KATHERINE P. NELSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE